

has an unreplicable pattern and information relating to said article, as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Indeck fails to disclose or suggest describing the unreplicable pattern and including the description with information relating to the article and securely associating the article, the label, and the tangible representation of said encrypted information, as recited in Claim 1. Applicants submit that digitizing an analog remanent noise signal, and recording the signal in the medium itself or elsewhere, as disclosed in Indeck, does not anticipate the features of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable.

Independent Claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, providing a label, said label having an unreplicable pattern, scanning the label to generate a signal representative of the unreplicable pattern and securely associating a tangible representation of the encrypted portion of the signal, the article and the label. Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Indeck that would disclose or suggest the features of Claim 10, particularly securely associating a tangible representation of the encrypted portion of the signal, the article and the label, as recited in Claim 10.

Claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, a method for verifying a label, which has an unreplicable pattern, and a tangible representation of at least an encrypted portion of a signal description of the unreplicable pattern being securely associated with the label. The label is scanned to generate a second signal descriptive of the unreplicable pattern and the decrypted portion is

compared to a corresponding portion of a second signal or a comparison is made between the encrypted portion of the descriptive signal and the corresponding encrypted portion of the second signal. Applicants submit that Indeck fails to disclose or suggest the features of Claim 11. Therefore Applicants submit that Claim 11 is allowable.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another independent claim discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' attorney may be reached at (203) 924-3845. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

*Thomas F. Presson*  
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
Applicants' Attorney  
Telephone (203) 924-3845

PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and  
Technology Law  
Department  
35 Waterview Drive  
P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000